

Fig. 3 of Nakano shows that the pilot signal is intermittently transmitted by the base station. Fig. 3 also shows an operation of the mobile unit 200 in which the reception period and the transmission period are alternately changed. It can be seen from Fig. 3 that the base station sends the pilot signal during the reception period of the mobile station 200. In other words, the base station continues to transmit the pilot signal while sending data signals in the traffic channels. This is because the system of Nakano is directed to a TDD (Time Division Duplex) communication. Thus, it should be noted that the base station continues to transmit the pilot signal and does not intermittently transmit it while sending the data signals in the traffic channels.

In contrast, the present invention intermittently transmits the pilot signal while the data signals are sent in traffic channels as shown in, for example, Fig. 8. Therefore, the Section 102 rejection should be considered withdrawn in view of the above claim amendment.

Regarding the 35 USC 103(a) rejection of claims 6 and 7, it is submitted that, as discussed above, Nakano fails to teach or suggest that the pilot signal is intermittently transmitted while traffic signals are sent. U.S. Patent 5,414,734 to Marchetto et al. teaches in Fig. 3 that the switch 54 selects either data produced by the data source 44 or the pilot signal produced by the pilot symbol generator 46. Correspondingly, on the reception side, the demodulator system and the channel estimator are selectively enabled.

In contrast, according to the present invention, the pilot signal and the traffic signals are simultaneously received. Hence, there is no need for any switching in the present invention as executed in Marchetto et al.

Further, Nakano and U.S. patent 5,646,632 to Khan et al. were cited against claims 8-12 and 14-17 under Section 103. It is noted that Khan fails to show the pilot channel (see column 2, line 66 to column 3, line 8). Hence, the combination of Nakano and Khan et al. does not make any claims of this application obvious.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Section 103 rejection should be withdrawn. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the application as amended be allowed.

2/12/98
Date



Attorney for Applicant
Richard J. Streit
c/o Ladas & Parry
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 25765